

**DRAFT -- AFTER FINAL  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

**III. Claim Objections -- Numbering of Claims:** Renumbering of claims by the examiner is noted. All references herein are to the new numbering. No other action required by applicant.

**Claims 24-26, 28, 31 § 103 (a) Rejected**  
**over Hillary IVO Conway**

**IV. As stated in MPEP Section 2143:** "To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met.

- First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.
- Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.
- Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." [emphasis added]

Examiner rejected Claims 24 -26, 28, 31 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillary in view of Conway. Conway does not suggest a display stand, instead they teach toward a folding portable notebook computer (Fig. 3B), which can be folded in several ways. Conway's split keyboard provides limited "support" to their flat panel display, but in an unstable manner. Placing Conway split keyboards on end teaches away from a stand. Webster's New World Dictionary [The World Publishing Company, New York, 1998] defines the verb "stand" as: to stand, be placed, as also in stable, state, station, etc.; and, defines the noun "stand" to be: "a standing; especially a stopping; halt or stop." Conway's split keyboards lacks the required stability for a stand; it lacks both physical halt or resistance to physical forces, such as to normal finger and hand forces. Thus Conway teaches away from a stand. There is no suggestion in Conway to make the requirement modifications to it split keyboard and combine it with Hillary's invention or other prior art.

In contrast applicant's Claim 24, teaches:

- 1) A display device stand [Preamble]
- 2) Flat panel display assembly
- 3) "a support arm means attached to the hinge and clamping means . . ." [element b.];
- 4) "the pivot and clamping means, the support arm means, and support pivot means work in cooperation for a plurality of position adjustments" [element c];

**DRAFT -- AFTER FINAL  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

- 5) "the base provides sufficient mechanical stability for the flat panel display assembly and element (a) - (c) . . ." [element d].

According to the MPEP 2143.03 -- all claim limitations (words) must be taught or suggested in the prior art. There are no such suggestions in Hillary, Conway, or other prior art to make the combination of Claim 24.

In addition, Conway does not suggest support arms that are in applicant's claims. The Webster's New World Dictionary defines a "arm" to be: "n. 1. an upper limb of the human body. 2. anything immediately resembling this; especially, a) a branch of a tree; b) a branch of a river." In studying the Conway reference closely, they do not suggest any modifications to include " support arms". All the words (limitations) in the applicant's claims must be carefully compared to the prior art, when determining obviousness. There is no suggestions in Conway, Hillary or other prior art to combine a stand, flat panel display, and adjustment mean in the manner taught by Claim 24. Therefore, applicant submits that Claim 24 appears allowable under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

As to Claim 25 and 26, they are both dependent claims of 24, and add other limitations (words). These limitations include inclination adjustment, elevation adjustment, and azimuth adjustment means. These words further distinguish Claim 25 and 26 from any combination of Conway, Hillary or other prior art at the time of the invention. Applicant submits that Claims 25 and 26 appear allowable under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

As to Claim 28, a "flat panel display assembly" [element a], "a first support pivot means . . ." [element b]; "a support are position adjustment means . . ." [element c]; "a second support pivot means . . . work in cooperation for rearward and forward inclination . . ." [element d]; and "a base unit . . . wherein the base unit is connected to the second support pivot means near the rear of the based unit . . ." [element e]. These elements of Claim 28 with all there limitations are not suggested in Conway, Hillary or other know prior art at the time of the invention. Applicant submits that Claim 28 appears allowable under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

***DRAFT -- AFTER FINAL  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE***

As to Claim 31, which is dependent claim of Claim 28, teaches: "a multi-section telescoping post means . . . fixed to the based unit". This limitation along with although limitations (words) of Claim 28 are not taught or suggested in Conway, Hillary or other know prior art at the time of the invention. Applicant submits that Claim 28 appears allowable under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

**Claim 29 Rejected Under § 103(a)**  
**Hillary IVO Conway and Park**

Applicant agrees that Conway and Park teach a display device comprising battery power. Claim 29, which is dependent on Claim 28, teaches "the flat panel display assembly is adapted to include a computer system and battery power . . . adapted to be removable . . . such that the display assembly can be operational without connection to elements (b) - (c)." However, Conway, Park and Hillary fail to suggest the function of removing the display from their apparatus. There is no teaching in above references that suggests removing the display. Hillary, Conway, Park and other prior art do not suggest removing a flat panel display from apparatus such as elements (a) - (d). However, applicant's Claim 29 does teach removing the display device to operate separately from the claimed apparatus of Claim 29. Thus, Claim 29 is non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**Claim 27 and 30 Rejected Under § 103(a)**  
**Makita IVO Nagaoka**

Applicant's independent Claim 27 teach "a base unit" [element a], "a base support pivot means attached to the base unit near the middle of the base unit" [element b], "a support arm position adjustment means . . ." [element c], "a panel support pivot means . . ." [element d], and "a flat panel display assembly connected to the panel support pivot means near the bottom . . ." [element e]. Makita teaches a display attached to a base unit via two arms attached to the base at the rear of the base. Makita does not suggest attaching support arm means any where else but the rear. Nagaoka teaches a conventional notebook computer without support arms. Makita when combined with Nagaoka or with other prior art do not suggest all the limitations of Claim 27. Examiner admits Nagaoka fails to disclose support

**DRAFT - AFTER FINAL  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

arm position adjustment means; but he also fails to suggest support arm position means. Nagaoka teaches away from Claim 27, since its display cannot be adjusted vertically in elevation position adjustment. Even if Mikita is combined with Nagaoka, all the elements and limitations of Claim 27 are not present. Therefore, for all the above reasons, Claim 27 appear non-obvious under the meaning of U.S.C § 103 (a).

As to Claim 30, which is dependent on Claim 27, teaches "a support arm position adjustment means adapted to a multi-section telescoping post means". Examiner states Makita teaches multi-section telescope post means (19). However, look at Makita, he only teaches a single support arm on each side. Makita's pivoting support arm pair (19) does not suggest a telescoping post means. Nagaoka teaches toward a conventional notebook computer and does not suggest a multi-section telescoping post. There are absolutely no telescoping posts or sliding functions suggested in Makita's or Nagaoka's references. Neither Makita, Nagaoka or other prior art teach all the limitations (words) of the Claim 30. Therefore, for all the above reasons, Claim 30 appear non-obvious under the meaning of U.S.C § 103 (a).

**Request For Notice Of Allowance**

V. Claims 24 - 31 particularly point out the inventions of the applicant, and the claims are novel, and non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103. No new matter has been added. Thus a Notice of Allowance is most respectfully solicited.

Sincerely,



Richard J. Ditzik  
Applicant Pro Se

307 Surrey Drive  
Bonita, CA 91902  
(619) 661-2252

Date: 02/26/99